

supported by the written description of the application as originally filed. As instructed by the Examiner, during the telephone conference, Applicants now provide the same explanation in writing along with citations to particular sections of the specification.

In particular, the Examiner stated that the following items were not described in the original specification and are considered new matter:

- 1) each of the cladding regions having a mean refractive index different than those of the adjacent regions, and
- 2) a given wavelength between 1510nm and 1590nm.

Applicants urge that the original specification describes each of the cladding regions having different mean refractive indices than adjacent regions at a number of places. For example, at page 26, lines 14-18, the respective mean refractive indices are described such that $n_0 > n_2 > n_1$ and $n_2 > n_3$. From these inequalities, it is apparent that the mean refractive indices of adjacent regions, and in particular cladding regions, **are different** (i.e., $n_1 \neq n_2$, and $n_2 \neq n_3$). Thus, Applicants urge that a skilled artisan would have recognized from the original application that the inventors were in possession of the invention of claims 1-15 as previously amended. Accordingly, all the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 USC 112 are satisfied in the present application and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 of claims 1-15 are respectfully requested.

Additionally, claims 9 and 10 recite a particular wavelength range of 1510 nm through 1590 nm. Applicants urge that FIG. 19 and its accompanying description illustrate and describe the **specific** wavelength range recited in the claims. In particular, at page 30, lines 12-14, the exemplary fiber is operated under a single mode at a wavelength of 1550nm. Furthermore, the

chromatic dispersion remains below -80 ps/nm/km (see, FIG. 19 and page 32, lines 10-14) within the recited wavelength range. Thus, Applicants urge that a skilled artisan would have recognized from the original application that the inventors were in possession of the invention of claims 9 and 10 as presently amended. Accordingly, all the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 USC 112 are satisfied in the present application and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 of claims 9 and 10, and dependent claim 11, are respectfully requested.


SUMMARY

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance and passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Wesley L. Strickland
Registration No. 44,363

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 WLS:cac
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: March 31, 2003